

Date: Tue, 4 May 93 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #126  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 4 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 126

Today's Topics:

    Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!  
    MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS) (3 msgs)  
        sick of it all (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Sun, 02 May 93 03:21:03 -0400  
From: usc!wupost!emory!dragon!blackwlf!nj8j!ben@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ean@VFL.Paramax.COM (Ed Naratil) writes:

> In article <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec  
> >  
> >  
> >     3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners,"  
> > are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four  
> > or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In...  
> >  
>  
> Does this mean that I can disable 7 channels of my 10 channel scanner  
> and then use it to monitor the 'restricted frequencies'?

Of course not. The scanner is still capable of scanning 4 or more  
frequencies, you just happen to not be using that capability.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |
| Packet: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally irrelevant." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | |
| or ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+-----+
```

-----

Date: Thu, 29 Apr 1993 16:24:57 GMT  
From: iris.mbvlab.wpafb.af.mil!blackbird.afit.af.mil!blackbird!  
jmillier@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <oowP3B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:

> \*Sorry, I don't know this editor that well.....anyway...I'm in Air Force  
> MARS and no we do not discuss radio frequencies on the air. We refer to  
> all the frequencies in the form of a designator.  
> The reason why we do this is for national security. And, yes, it is to  
> obscure the meaning of the transmission...the casual listener does not  
> need to know everything MARS does. In the interest of national security,  
> in time of war or something, if sensitive traffic was being routed thru  
> MARS, we don't want "Charlie" following us across the band.

That's fine, when you're operating on MARS frequencies. However, if you are operating on amateur radio frequencies, the use of those designators would be a technical violation of Part 97 rules regarding use of codes. If you're in contact with a ham who is also a MARS operator and you wish to move the contact over to MARS frequencies, you'll need to come up with something other than that designator to indicate \_which\_ frequency you're moving to.

If I may inject at this point...

MARS business isn't supposed to be discussed on the ham bands at all. There have been several (in USAF MARS, anyway) MARS broadcasts on this point. I don't know how to answer the last statment above. If the two are close enough, then simply stating "I'll meet you on the MARS VHF repeater (or simplex) frequency" should be adequate. If they want to meet on an HF frequency, they'll have to check in with the net control on that frequency, who has already-known hours and frequencies of operation. MARS isn't for ragchewing, after all (a point which some of our members seem to forget all too often).

(Now, let's see if I can get GNUS to post this ;- ) ).

73,

Jeff NH6ZW/N8 AFA1HE

--

Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1D0)  
AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH  
Welcome to Ohio: Our state flower is the orange highway construction barrel.  
Help eliminate FOD in our lifetime.

-----

Date: Mon, 3 May 1993 16:02:57 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!afterlife!blackbird.afil.af.mil!blackbird!  
jmillier@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My experience was with Army MARS. Would someone from Air Force and Navy/Marine  
Corp MARS care to look up and post the exact paragraph regarding use of  
encryption  
by MARS operators??

Glad to. Paraphrased from USAF MARS Operating Directive, Volume I, Chapter 9,  
para  
4b(1)(c):

Encrypted personal messages are not suitable for transmission via MARS. Military  
units may originate encrypted messages.

That's it. No other mention of encryption in the entire MOD, except for the  
warning  
about not discussing classified material on phone patches (and the briefing about  
same which must be given before initiating a patch).

73, Jeff

--

Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1D0)  
AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH  
Welcome to Ohio: Our state flower is the orange highway construction barrel.  
Help eliminate FOD in our lifetime.

-----

Date: Mon, 03 May 93 17:23:58 PDT  
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

andrews@fmsystm.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:

> >They vary from place to place. As a general rule MARS frequencies are on  
> >the outer edges of the ham bands. For instance, one MARS repeater here  
> >has the input on one edge of a VHF band and the output on the other.

Hmmm...I seem to have posted my answer twice. Software problems and I apologize.

> I am aware that MARS frequencies differ from place to place, and that  
> they are somewhere (for 2M) between 140-144 and 148-150.7 Mhz. I've  
> been searching those frequencies, and have been able to only find  
> CAP stuff (not that I'm not looking for CAP you understand).

Could it be that there is no MARS activity in your area?

> But that's the point, I \_am\_ a traffic handler. I handle about 30 to 50  
> messages through the NTS via packet and local net's (some of the NTS  
> guys \_think\_ \_they ARE\_ handling MARS traffic!).

Some of your local NTS ops probably are handling MARS traffic. If it comes from or goes to MARS, it's MARS traffic. Ask these ops about MARS in your area.

> Except for the facts; 1. I am a No-code (Yea) Tech, so I can't be on  
> the Low Bands, and 2. I don't have any Low Band equipment, because  
> of <1.> so, 3. I can't join Mars, even though I would really like  
> to.

No need to apologize for #1 (I know you weren't). This does not stop you from owning LB equipment. Some of the stuff is really very inexpensive.

> >I think that it is highly unlikely that any MARS station will be handling  
> >sensitive traffic. The military has their own frequencies for this and  
> >they are ciphered, when necessary.

> The sensitivity is not my concern, just how \_they\_ get the "job done".

Very well, thank you.

> >Which is to say, MARS traffic and military traffic are two different  
> >animals.  
> >

> True, true... And NTS traffic is a different single-celled organism.

NTS traffic is quite understood by many, if not most hams. This is truly unfortunate. My elmer was an NTS op. He got me started working NTS shortly after I got my tech (grandfather type) license. I was NCS a month later. I find NTS to be great fun, especially as NTS gives ham ops a real opportunity to explain the hobby to folks who don't quite understand or don't have a clue.

> >And, in my opinion, saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" is no different than  
> >saying "I'll meet you on the club repeater".  
> >  
> I'm in agreement there... (no complaints from this peanut in the  
> galiary)

Goodonya, mate.

73 de KA6ETB

-----  
Date: 3 May 93 18:22:32 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: sick of it all  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Since almost anyone can talk, and a lot of folks seem to think that Morse is an antiquated form of communication, I suggest we eliminate BOTH the CW and written exams as licensing requirements. Licenses should be issued by simple recommendation. Here's how it works:

Prospective hams only need visit the shack of an already licensed amateur, and successfully engage in five(5) QSO's on any band. The prospective ham will need to report his/her name and location (QTH), and be able to demonstrate the use of Q-signals, such as saying "QSL" every time the conversation is turned over to him/her. That's all it takes. Then, the existing amateur sends in a form recommending you, and, within just a month or two, you're on the air as a licensed amateur radio operator.

Is this what you want?

Howard           hlester@as.arizona.edu

-----  
Date: Mon, 3 May 1993 19:31:58 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
darwin.sura.net!uvaarpa!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!jeg7e@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: sick of it all  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QBE562E9@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

>Is this what you want?

Do you realize you sound like a fool?  
--

These opinions may not be unique, and they may not express the views of U.Va.

```
-----  
| Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \      /___ | SILENCE = DEATH  
| Security and Technology Planning R&D    \    /   / | Hate is *NOT*  
| I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \  /   /  | a Family Value!  
| The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall     \\/   /   | -----  
~~~~~\~~~~~ 73 de KD4CQY
```

-----  
Date: 4 May 93 01:15:19 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: sick of it all  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

>Since almost anyone can talk, and a lot of folks seem to think that Morse is  
>an antiquated form of communication, I suggest we eliminate BOTH the CW and  
>written exams as licensing requirements. Licenses should be issued by simple  
>recommendation. Here's how it works:  
>...  
>Is this what you want?

Can't say I've heard anyone suggest that. Although in some countries they  
require proof of listening to 200 or more QSOs through the submission of  
QSL cards. Perhaps they figure that if the amateur learns to listen before  
opening his or her mouth, they might make better amateurs. Sounds like it  
has merit to me. You should try it.

I think it's been stated pretty clearly what's "wanted". Make the  
licensing requirements relevant and related to the privileges granted.  
Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can  
copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit  
bizarre. In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams  
substantially beefed up. I just checked out AUTOEXAM and discovered I can  
pass element 4A without studying. That's ridiculous. In fact, I think  
I've only "studied" for all the written elements a total of 4 hours and I

could possibly get lucky and pass 4B. So perhaps not giving the written exam wouldn't be much different than it is today.

As a little bit of anecdotal evidence; I just saw a packet posting from a general or advanced class licensee that wanted to know if you could use a beam antenna designed for satellite work on terrestrial repeaters. You apparently can get a general or advanced license without knowing anything about polarization of radio waves. Amazing.

I haven't heard anyone advocate "giving" licenses away. Did you read that somewhere? Let's evolve and encourage amateurs to learn something they can use to improve the state of the art, not preserve the past. Amateur radio is not a historical preservation society the last time I checked. This isn't about making it "easier" it's about making it relevant.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 3 May 1993 15:29:00 GMT  
From: news.tek.com!cascade.ens.tek.com!ronk@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6DrBI.9u5@fmsysm.ncoast.org>, <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US>,  
<C6FLKH.50x@fmsysm.ncoast.org>  
Reply-To : Ron.C.Kirkpatrick@tek.com  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <C6FLKH.50x@fmsysm.ncoast.org>, andrews@fmsysm.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:

|>  
|> Except for the facts; 1. I am a No-code (Yea) Tech, so I can't be on  
|> the Low Bands, and 2. I don't have any Low Band equipment, because  
|> of <1.> so, 3. I can't join Mars, even though I would really like  
|> to.

The MARS requirements are: 1. Amateur Tech. class license or above (if Novice, can join, but must upgrade to Tech. or above within 6 months).  
2. Equipment capable of operating on the HF MARS frequencies.

No-Code Tech's can and have joined MARS. Since the MARS frequencies are outside of the Amateur bands, they are not restricted.

--  
Ron Kirkpatrick  
News Administrator/Postmaster  
Tektronix, Inc

503-627-6707

-----  
Date: 3 May 93 15:47:52 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!procyon.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <oowP3B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us>, <1993Apr30.220650.171705@locus.com>,  
<1993May1.181744.14700@kd4nc.uucp>om  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993May1.181744.14700@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:  
>  
>Oh come on, Dana....  
>

Oh come on, John....

>Let's change the scenario here...let's say I want my buddy to call me  
>on the phone at work.... I say "Call me at my work number." Since I didn't  
>exactly tell everyone what my work number is, or told people where I worked,  
>then I've just encrypted that transmission and I'm guilty....

I wouldn't call this a code. If you had said "Call me at telephone  
number Roger-Fox-Dog", and then refused to disclose to anyone who asked  
what number "Roger-Fox-Dog" is, then you are using a code. Saying "Call  
me at work" may or may not be intentional encoding.

>I don't care....let someone pink slip me ... If I'm down here talking to  
>my friend Eddie, who's Army MARS, and I tell him "Go to MARS PACKET" then  
>that is not a cipher...I don't have to tell him and the whole repeater where  
>I'm going....one, it's none of their business.... I CAN be secret if I  
>want to....you probably bitch and moan about the guy that uses the cover  
>tone on the autopatch...and then you only hear one side of the conversation.

No, you cannot be secret if you want to. Part 97.113(d) sez so. However,  
saying "Go to MARS packet" is not a cipher, as long as you are willing to  
explain what MARS stands for. If you said "Go to MARS frequency  
Alpha-Delta", and you are not willing to reveal what the meaning of  
"MARS frequency Alpha-Delta" is (i.e. which frequency), then you have  
used a code.

In my case, a MARS op said "We use designators on amateur radio to  
conceal the actual frequency". This is a clear case of concealing the  
meaning of a transmission, and the intent is clear.





unixg.ubc.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!alberta!adec23!mark@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5syJE.C1x@squam.banyan.com>, <1993Apr23.144538.8318@ve6mgs.ampr.org>,  
<C65nD4.D9C@squam.banyan.com>  
Subject : Re: CW = effective utilization?

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

>You actually filter your transmitted RF through a 100 Hz filter after the  
>finals? Filter must get REAL hot...

Oh, and you think that the input audio bandwidth to the transmitter is different than the transmitted bandwidth for the modulation scheme? Call what Icom does as overkill, but they feed the SSB section of their rigs with CW tone. If you filter this tone with a 100Hz wide filter, you get 100Hz SSB bandwidth.

The DSP based rigs do the same thing to the input audio to clean up the transmitter spurs.

>There WILL be harmonics generated by the squared-off edges of your on-off  
>keying of the carrier sine wave.

Do you know what a key klick filter is? BEFORE you build that spectrum analyzer you claimed, please understand the theory first ...

Ciao -- Mark

-----

Date: Mon, 3 May 1993 18:25:07 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!  
m2.dseg.ti.com!ernest!cmptrc!carter@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,  
<930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>c.ti.c  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:  
>rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) writes:  
>>From what I understand MARS doesn't operate under Amateur, ie Part 97  
>>regulations, so why would it be a problem for them to obscure the  
>>meaning?  
>

>Because the discussion Dana relates was taking place not on MARS  
>channels, but on regular amateur frequencies. On THOSE, it's illegal  
>to use codes to obscure meanings.  
>  
> - Brian

Hmmm, then we've got a new possible violation to consider. In my old MARS outfit, that would be viewed as conducting MARS business in the Amateur Service, and would be ill-advised.

Just a thought...

--

Carter R. Bennett, Jr. - Scientist | "Oh my God! I \_AM\_ a nerd!!!"  
carter@scilab.lonestar.org - home | - C. Bennett, Sept 25, 1992, after  
carter@cmptrc.lonestar.org - work | realizing he had been talking about  
KI5SR | "market availability of preconfigured Toll-House cookies."

-----  
Date: 3 May 93 15:34:45 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!procyon.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>, <C6D87v.Jwr@news.Hawaii.Edu>0  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <C6D87v.Jwr@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:  
>>rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) writes:  
>>>From what I understand MARS doesn't operate under Amateur, ie Part 97  
>>>regulations, so why would it be a problem for them to obscure the  
>>>meaning?

>>

>>Because the discussion Dana relates was taking place not on MARS  
>>channels, but on regular amateur frequencies. On THOSE, it's illegal  
>>to use codes to obscure meanings.

>>

>> - Brian

>

>Reread the article, Brian; the MARS operator was talking ABOUT the  
>designators being used, not USING the designators in place of frequencies.  
>A small, but important point.

Don't bother re-reading the article, Brian, you did understand correctly and Mr. Herman did not. At no time have I suggested that

it is illegal to discuss the use of codes and ciphers on amateur radio. I pointed out that a MARS op had explained to me that frequency designators are used \*on amateur radio\* to \*conceal\* the actual frequencies. I was suggesting that it \*is\* illegal to use frequency designators on amateur radio to conceal the actual frequency.

[ I seem to have upset Mr. Herman; he's not only intentionally misquoting me on the net here, he also sent me a couple of flaming messages in my mailbox, followed by a number of notes consisting of everything I'd written on this thread. Strange. ]

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #126

\*\*\*\*\*